

SM-



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,504	11/29/2000	Kazuo Ohba	KAM1-BN12	5063

7590 10/29/2002
Price Gess & Ubell
2100 S E Main Street Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92714

EXAMINER

ABDELWAHED, ALI F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3712

DATE MAILED: 10/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

S.M.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/701,504

Applicant(s)

OHBA, KAZUO

Examiner

Ali Abdelwahed

Art Unit

3712

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-4, 11-18 and 21-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-10, 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The use of the trademark EVERFLEX has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

^{57, 9, 10}
Claims ~~5-10~~, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 3712

Claim 5 recites the limitation "the other end" in lines ⁸~~9~~ and ⁹~~10~~. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 6 recites the limitations "~~the arm~~", "the shoulders", and "~~the end~~" in lines ⁶~~4~~, ~~7~~, ~~8~~, and ~~12~~. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 7 recites the limitations "~~the arm~~", and "the shoulders" in lines ⁶~~4~~, ~~7~~, and ~~8~~. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the molten molding material" in line 15. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim(s) 9 and 10 depend from rejected claim(s) 5 and 6, respectively, and include all of the limitations of claim(s) 5 and 6 thereby rendering these dependent claim(s) indefinite.

Claim 19 recites the limitations "the arm", and "said molding space" in lines 2, 4, 5, and 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim(s) 20 depends from rejected claim(s) 7 and includes all of the limitations of claim(s) 7 thereby rendering this dependent claim(s) indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-10, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,470,784 to Piotrovsky in view of JP 62071616 A to Takara Co. Ltd.

Piotrovsky discloses the claimed invention except for teaching the method of molding a doll's arm, and having a pair of molding spaces. However, Takara Co. Ltd. teaches the method of molding a doll's arm. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Piotrovsky, in view of Takara Co. Ltd., such that it would provide the device of Piotrovsky with an armature for a doll arm, instead of a doll leg as disclosed by Piotrovsky, for the purpose of molding a doll's arm.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the device of Piotrovsky with a pair of molding spaces, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Art Unit: 3712


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ali Abdelwahed whose telephone number is (703) 305-3311. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on (703) 308-1745.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

AA
10/24/2002

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Banks', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

DERRIS H. BANKS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700